



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

81

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,354	03/26/2004	Andrew Bowman	B-00019-001	1557

25179 7590 02/18/2005

A PATENT LAWYER CORP, PC  
R WILLIAM GRAHAM  
22 S ST CLAIR ST  
DAYTON, OH 45402

EXAMINER
----------

ROSE, ROBERT A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3723

DATE MAILED: 02/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/811,354

Applicant(s)

BOWMAN, ANDREW

Examiner

Robert Rose

Art Unit

3723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/26/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-2 are presented for examination.
2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dynia. Dynia discloses a telescoping guide comprising substantially all of the structure of Applicant's claims 1-2, except for the provision of an additional sleeve. Note first and second sleeves(70)(78) with respective lip portions(72),(86), roller member (68), mounting plate(34), and retainer(62). While only two telescoping sleeves are disclosed in Dynia, it is old and well known in the telescopic pole art, to provide additional sleeves as necessary to extend the elongated support while still allowing the telescopic collapsing of the sleeves. To merely provide an additional sleeve with associated lip, between the first and second sleeves of Dynia to allow the roller to achieve an extended reach for higher ceilings or walls, would have been at most an obvious duplication of parts, and well within the skill of those of ordinary skill in the art. Applicant's preamble

Art Unit: 3723


which recites "for a concrete saw" is not deemed patentably limiting, since only the telescoping guide per se, is claimed.

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Haase et al, Tucker, Zuzelo, Lewis, and Wright are cited of interest to show other concrete saw cutters having hinged guide rollers.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert Rose at telephone number (571) 272-4494.

rr

February 15, 2005.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert A. Rose", written in a cursive style.

**ROBERT A. ROSE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**ART UNIT 323**